



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/783,403 | 02/20/2004 | Lee Mantis | 135/1A | 6341 |

7590 09/26/2006
Schwartz Law Firm, P.C.
SouthPark Towers
Suite 530
6100 Fairview Road
Charlotte, NC 28210

EXAMINER

LARSON, JUSTIN MATTHEW

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3727

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/783,403 | MANTIS, LEE | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Justin M. Larson | 3727 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Justin M. Larson. (3) _____
 (2) Jeffrey J. Schwartz. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Drew (5,762,246), Bergh et al. (D381,947), Stewart (5,503,316).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 NATHAN J. NEWHOUSE
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Schwartz proposed amendments to the claims to better define the structure of Applicant's CD visor panel over Golenz as applied in the final rejection and prior art Drew and Bergh et al. The proposed amendments were aimed to define the dimension and orientation of Applicant's visor panel and to recite that the fastener means on the panel extended between the edges of the visor panel's shortest dimension (width). Examiner pointed out that both Drew and Bergh et al. (Figure 8 and 9, respectively) show visor panels like that of Applicant's invention, the panels both having fastener means extending across the panels between the edges of their shortest dimension. In response to Mr. Swartz's attempt to define over the structure of Stewart, Examiner asserted that Stewart is being relied on solely for the teaching of removably attaching an organizer panel to a vehicle's sun visor using a hook-and-loop fastener strap, not for the organizer panel structure.